

the bill. The way the bill is written and now I think most of you who are interested have had a chance to find the amendment, the way the bill is written it says that under certain federal provisions there is the allowance for manufacturer to establish this complaint resolution procedure. That if this bill should be passed then the Director of Motor Vehicles following the guidelines laid down in that federal statute would set up a similar procedure. I don't know what the details of that procedure would consist of but once it was in place then any manufacturer who desired to take advantage of it could do so. Any manufacturer who chose to do so would by so doing compel any aggrieved consumer to go through that procedure before being able to bring an action in court. So, my amendment says that it would be optional for the consumer to follow that procedure prior to going to court. I don't see where it would create any problem at all because if the consumer thought a manufacturer were reasonable then it would be desirable to go through that procedure. On the other hand, if the consumer felt that the manufacturer wanted to stonewall, being forced to go through that procedure before you could go to court, could cause the consumer to be without the use of his or her vehicle for the amount of time that this mandatory dispute procedure were being resorted to. After the loss of that time, being without a vehicle, only after that could you then go to court and I think that is unfair. So if you have any questions about the amendment I'll answer them but I hope you will bring the bill back and attach it. And if you do, then there is nothing else that I will attempt to do with the bill.

PRESIDENT: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, I would oppose bringing the bill back and I hope we would go ahead and vote, Final Reading. That is not to question the wisdom or the sincerity of Senator Chambers particular proposal. I think it is the old story, one person can look at something and say, this is too high and the other one can say, this is too low. I think the mandatory procedure, in fact, makes it highly more likely that the matter will be settled, that there will not be any necessity for litigation of lawsuits, that both sides will walk away from the table fairly satisfied. For that reason I would oppose changing it. The Attorney General has issued his opinion now and he has said that this proposal is constitutional. Yes, he said there are areas where it could have been worded better but I guess that is true on about 99% of the bills that we pass. Why don't we give it a years try with the mandatory procedure and get it passed so it is effective for the 1984 model year, and as you know the model year is going to start very